



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/964,502

09/28/2001

Robert L. Van Egmond

10559-470001

2556

20985

7590

11/19/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC

P.O. BOX 1022

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

CHUNG TRANS, XUONG MY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2833

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/964,502	Applicant(s) VAN EGMOND ET AL.	
	Examiner Xuong M. Chung-Trans	Art Unit 2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. This is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/28/07.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beecher, II et al. (6,291,767).

Beecher discloses a network communication housing comprising: a main body 10; at least one connector (102,107,108) mounted onto a surface of the main body; and an easel 12 coupled to the main body. Beecher does not explicitly disclose that the easel pivotally coupled to the main body. However, the use the pivotally means (e.g. a hinge) are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Beecher housing to employ a hinge that pivotally coupled to both the easel and the body in order to allow the easel pivotally open and close to the body as need.

As per claims 2-4 and 6, Beecher discloses at least one networking circuit located inside the main body that is coupled with the at least one connector and electromagnetic interference shielding (EMI) mounted onto the main body; the easel 12 further comprises at least one serrated edge for accepting a wire or cable; the serrated

edge is semi-circular notch, the easel contains at least one hole for accepting at least one wire or cable.

As per claim 5, Beecher discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the at least one serrated edge is comprised of at least one "V-shaped" notch. Beecher discloses such semi-circular notch. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the easel of the Beecher to have at least one "V-shaped" notch in stead of semi-circular notch in order to arrange the wire neatly and prevent entanglement.

As per claim 7, Beecher discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the easel further comprises: a stop to prevent the easel from pivoting too far. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a stop in order to prevent the easel from over-rotation.

As per claim 8, Beecher discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the main body has an edge that overlaps an edge of the easel. Beecher, however, does disclose that an edge of the easel overlaps an edge of the body. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have an edge of the body overlaps an edge of the easel instead of the edge of the easel overlaps an edge of the body, since the court has held that rearrange parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

As per claim 9, it would have been obvious that a second serrated edge can also be located at a backside of the housing device in which both the first and second serrated edges can accept at least one wire or cable.

As per claims 10-16, these claims recite a method corresponding to the network communication housing of claims 1-9; therefore, they are rejected under the similar rationale.

As per claims 17-26, these claims differ from claims 1-9 in that they further recite at least one foot for supporting the main body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ at least one foot for supporting the main body as needed and thereby stabilizing supporting the main body and/or prevent damage/scratch to the body.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xuong M. Chung-Trans whose telephone number is (571) 272-2002. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on (571) 272-2800 extension 33.. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
09/964,502
Art Unit: 2833

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Xuong Chung-Trans
Patent Examiner